

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 8, 9 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardouin (U.S. Patent 5,966,655) in view of Murto (U.S. Patent 5,966,662) and Heinonen et al. (U.S. Patent 6,438,385). The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-6, 10, 11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardouin in view of Murto, Heinonen et al. and Merriam (U.S. Patent 6,408,187). The Examiner has rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardouin in view of Murto, Heinonen et al. and Rydbeck et al. (U.S. Patent 5,930,718).

In response to the Office Action dated September 10, 2003 and the Advisory Action dated December 29, 2003, in addition to the comments and arguments contained herein, please reconsider the arguments contained in the Response filed December 10, 2003.

Claims 1, 2 and 12 are in independent form. Each of independent Claims 1, 2 and 12 recite alerting the user of an entrance into a paging alert level restricted area. The user of the device disclosed in the present application is aware of the entrance into a restricted area by the alert. Heinonen et al. does **not** alert **the user**. Heinonen et al. transmits a broadcast message, which is detected by a mobile station that mutes in response thereto; the Heinonen et al. device performs no alerting of the user of an entrance into a restricted area. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 2 and 12 is respectfully requested.

Regarding Claim 15, the Examiner states that Hardouin discloses "alerting the user to either accept or reject the restricted mode". Hardouin allows a user to change audio alerting to vibrational alerting. Hardouin does not allow a user to override the restricted mode setting as does the device disclosed in Claim 15 of the present application. The ability by the user to accept or reject the restricted mode is not disclosed by any of the cited references. Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Based on at least the foregoing, independent Claims 1, 2, 12 and 15 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 3-11 and 13-14 and 16, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 3-11 and 13-16 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-16, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr